



REDACTED

STAT

of the grandiose work on the electrification of the country, this task had an especially serious significance. He added that the writers share the responsibility for this task with the editors. The editors had made one appeal to the writers on this subject on page 72 of Elektrichestvo No 4 /1950/.

Petrov said he did not mean that the scientific and technical level of the articles should be lower, but that they should combine practical and scientific values, so that the reader could avail himself of the results of research and the calculations contained in them. Both theoretical and practical engineering articles should be published, but they should be written so as to be easily read, and should contain concrete examples of theoretical work.

Petrov concluded by requesting the writers to pay greater attention to the composition of their articles, and to take a more active part in discussions in Elektrichestvo. Such discussions would make possible fuller surveys of theoretical as well as engineering and technical problems, including the improvement of the terminology of electrical engineering. He pointed out the desirability of systematic discussion of the articles by VENTOR. He called on the writers to eliminate all traces of groveling before the engineering achievements of capitalist countries and to reflect as fully as possible the achievements of Soviet science and engineering in their own work.

After expressing his appreciation of the meeting and of Petrov's report, Professor V. Yu. Lomonosov, Doctor of Technical Science, MEI (Moscow Power Engineering Institute), said that he, as one of the editors, had unfortunately, often encountered various forms of conservatism in some articles. At times he added, after what seemed superfluous work to establish their conclusions, the writers ended their articles with details not necessary for structure of clarity. He said that there was no reason for inflicting such complicated studies on the reader, and that formulas were often inserted which could serve no purpose, since they could not be reduced to numerical expressions. Lomonosov felt that there would be fewer of these formulas if the writers who were carried away by them had to make calculations according to their own formulas. But he said that complicated theoretical work should not be eliminated even though only a very limited circle of readers had a legitimate interest in it.

It might be well, he continued, to have a small edition of the periodical in addition to the usual one, for the growing amount of electrical engineering material and important theoretical work of great scientific and practical significance.

Professor M. P. Kostenko, Corresponding Member, Academy of Sciences USSR, LPI (Leningrad Polytechnic Institute imeni Kalinin) called the attention of the meeting to the somewhat unsatisfactory preparation of articles by many writers. He said that a good many articles are hurriedly put together from dissertations. There is certainly nothing wrong in the wish of writers of dissertations to see them in print, he added, but they must not forget that not all the material compiled for dissertations is of interest in an article. Professor Kostenko felt that about 80 percent of any dissertation should be omitted to make it an interesting article for Elektrichestvo, but that the writers seldom realized this fact. He explained that the editorial staff spends a great deal of time examining the raw material in order to extract the data worth publishing. If they succeed, the article is then returned to the author for revision and it is, perhaps, only after months that the rewritten article can be printed. Then, the writer blames the editors and reviewers, not himself.

Writers should have a wider view of their times and of the nature of problems treated in their articles, and should not write for a narrow circle of readers, Kostenko said. He added that reviewers should write so that even if

REDACTED

STAT

~~REDACTED~~

the reader has never read the book he can obtain a general idea of its content. Quite often reviews contained only critical remarks and gave no complete picture of the book criticized, he said.

In conclusion, Kostenko said that primary organizations of VNIIE should take part in discussions of articles in Elektrichestvo. The best plan would be for these organizations to review the articles. The writer would then improve his article and deliver it together with the comments of the organizations to Elektrichestvo.

I. E. Besmertnyy, Candidate of Technical Science, ("Kommunenergoprojekt" Trust) urged writers to pay more attention to writing surveys, which are usually interesting to a wider circle of readers. He also suggested that the editorial office should make sure that a reviewer who asks a writer to revise his article should receive the final version of the article. Otherwise misunderstandings are possible. For example, he cited the publication in Elektrichestvo, No 4, 1950 of an article by Ye. E. Priklonskiy on "Selecting the Number of Transformer Substations." After examining the article at the request of the editorial office, Besmertnyy made some suggestions about bringing the article up to date. The rewritten article was not returned to him. Only when he saw it published in issue No 4 did he discover that the article had not been rewritten along the lines indicated.

Yu. M. Galonin, Candidate of Technical Science, AKKh [17] imeni Pamyat'nykh, agreed with the report of the editor and admitted that the writers still had a great deal to do in perfecting the format of their scientific writings. They should never forget their readers who include scientists, engineers, and members of higher technical schools, etc.

Professor V. Ye. Rozenfel'd, Doctor of Technical Science MEI, said: "We authors think of ourselves, when we should be thinking of our readers." It is of course, he added, impossible to ask a reader who works in a narrow field (e.g. automatic generator control of diesel-electric locomotives) to be interested in articles on special subjects like the electrification of rural districts, or electrical terminology. But it is reasonable to ask that a reader in a field related to the subject of an article be able to understand it easily. Finally, Rozenfel'd said that the value of an article must be weighed by the editorial office, and, if, after suggestions from the reviewer and the editors, the article cannot be put in suitable form by the writer, it should not be printed.

L. B. Gayler, Doctor of Technical Science (Laboratory of Electric Drives), said that all writers should join in the efforts being made by the editors of Elektrichestvo, and also pay more attention to the voice of the reader. He gave many examples of unsatisfactory articles, and showed the urgency of the situation by the fact, unflattering to writers and editors alike, that issue No 4, which had made the well-known appeal to the writers, teemed with articles of no appeal to readers. Certainly, he said, the writers should reform, but this did not lessen the responsibility of the editorial staff.

Professor S. A. Burguchev MIMESKh (Moscow Institute of Mechanization and Electrification of Agriculture) pointed out that the duty of editors was to make thorough examinations of submitted articles and to recommend to the writers concrete methods of improvement.

Ye. E. Priklonskiy, Engineer, GIAP MKhP (State Institute of the Nitrogen Industry, Ministry of Chemical Industry), called the attention of writers to problems of the national economy which should be considered in engineering and technical articles. He expressed the hope that the editors would have more meetings with the writers.

~~REDACTED~~

STAT

~~SECRET~~

P. I. Voyevodin, MONITOR, welcomed the idea of a preliminary survey of articles by organizations of the society and requested writers to take the initiative in bringing concrete suggestions to organizations to which MONITOR would give the proper instructions.

Professor V. N. Mil'shteyn, Doctor of Technical Science, NGIMIP (Moscow State Institute of Measures and Measuring Instruments), proposed that relations between writers and editors be better organized by more regular meetings. The editors should discuss subjects of articles and scientific and technical problems with groups of writers, he said.

A. I. Fyurstenburg called attention to the extremely long time reviewers kept articles submitted to them.

A. A. Yermilov, Tsentroelektromontazh (Electrical Installation Trust for the Central Region) expressed his satisfaction with the conference. He emphasized the importance of the problems discussed and the need of organizing discussions in the periodical. He suggested inviting specialists in each field to take part in discussing articles on their subjects.

#### Conclusions

The writers unanimously supported the appeal of the editors. This was noted by Professor Petrov in his closing speech. The conference passed a resolution stating that the problem of further improvement of the periodical was the joint responsibility of editors and writers. Members of the conference approved the initiative of the editorial staff of Elektrichestvo and the administrations of VEITOE and MONITOR in calling the meeting and felt that it would be advantageous to arrange periodic meetings to discuss further improvements in the quality of the articles printed. The suggestion in Professor Petrov's report and the wishes of readers at the four conferences at Moscow, Kiev, Leningrad, and Sverdlovsk in 1948 and 1949 were accepted as guides. The conference also approved many criticisms made by readers during past years. It held that the basic conditions for published articles should be that they combined scientific value with practical utility for scientific workers, engineers, etc. Moreover, accepted articles should bring out recent achievements in science and engineering and advanced procedures in industry and other branches of Soviet economy. To help shorten the time before publication and to ensure the greatest possible number of up-to-date articles, writers should pay strict attention to the regulations of the journal as to the specifications for manuscripts submitted to it. The conference called upon all writers of future creative work to be guided by the resolutions adopted by the conference.

A letter of welcome from Comrade Stalin was received with great enthusiasm.

- E N D -

- 4 -

~~SECRET~~